



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

## Citizenship and Education Policies in the post-Yugoslav States

**Citation for published version:**

Pantic, N 2012 'Citizenship and Education Policies in the post-Yugoslav States' CITSEE Working Paper Series, no. 23, vol. 2012, CITSEE.

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

© Pantic, N. (2012). Citizenship and Education Policies in the post-Yugoslav States. (CITSEE Working Paper Series; Vol. 2012, No. 23). CITSEE.

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





CITSEE WORKING PAPER SERIES



# Citizenship and Education Policies in the post-Yugoslav States

Nataša Pantić

Working Paper 2012/23



European Research Council



---

University of Edinburgh, School of Law  
The Europeanisation of Citizenship in the Successor States of the Former Yugoslavia  
(CITSEE)

**Citizenship and Education Policies in the post-Yugoslav States**

Nataša Pantić

The Europeanisation of Citizenship in the Successor States of the Former Yugoslavia  
(CITSEE)

CITSEE Working Paper Series 2012/23

Edinburgh, Scotland, UK

ISSN 2046-4096

© 2012 Nataša Pantić

This text may be downloaded only for personal research purposes.  
Additional reproduction for other purposes, whether in hard copies or electronically,  
requires the consent of the authors.

Requests should be addressed to [citsee@ed.ac.uk](mailto:citsee@ed.ac.uk)

The view expressed in this publication cannot in any circumstances be regarded as  
the official position of the European Union.

Published in the United Kingdom  
The University of Edinburgh  
School of Law  
Old College, South Bridge  
Edinburgh, EH8 2QL  
Scotland, UK

[www.law.ed.ac.uk/citsee/workingpapers](http://www.law.ed.ac.uk/citsee/workingpapers)

This work was supported by funding from the CITSEE project (The Europeanisation of Citizenship in the Successor States of the Former Yugoslavia), based at the University of Edinburgh, UK. CITSEE is funded by the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme, ERC Grant no. 230239, and the support of the ERC is acknowledged with thanks.

For information about the Project please visit the project website at  
<http://law.ed.ac.uk/citsee>

## **Citizenship and Education Policies in the post-Yugoslav States**

Nataša Pantić<sup>1</sup>

### **Abstract**

This paper explores interactions between citizenship and education policies in six post-Yugoslav contexts, focusing on group and individual education rights, ethnocentric, multicultural and civic elements of citizenship in education policies, and the extent to which they encourage inclusive or exclusive concepts of citizenship. These interactions are explored by looking at education system structures, language and curricula policies. Universal and consociation education systems have been distinguished, with the ethnocentric and exclusive citizenship concepts reflected in the context-dependent status of different minorities, and in the uses of education to perpetuate dominant ethnic groups at different levels. Inclusive elements have been recognised in relation to the improving status of the Roma minority in education. A number of minority language instruction options, mostly available as a group right, reflect multicultural approaches to linguistic and cultural rights in education, although ethnocentric motives can be discerned behind their territorial implementation. Civic elements have been recognised in the introduction of civic education as curricular units, but ethnocentric ones prevail in other relevant school subject curricula, textbooks, and especially in hidden curricula precluding intercultural contact. The emphasis on group rights is strong, while monitoring non-discrimination and protection of individual human rights is scant.

### **Keywords:**

citizenship, education, minority rights, civic education, former Yugoslavia

### **Introduction: Citizenship and Education**

‘All you need to know about the ways in which a polity imagines and defines its members could be found in its education’ claims Aleksandar Hemon in his commentary on education in his native Bosnia and Herzegovina (Hemon 2012:7). Hemon introduces his commentary with a witty account of the banishment of Santa Claus (locally known by the secular name of Deda Mraz – ‘Grandpa Frost’) from 24 kindergartens in Sarajevo as having no place in Islamic tradition. Hemon described ‘the old man’ as a ‘civic, communal character’, welcomed by all children in pre-war Yugoslavia, and the incident of his banishment as a ‘punch in his fat gut’ in a post-Yugoslav collapse state (Hemon 2012:1). For him, the Deda Mraz affair is symptomatic of the politicization of education, designed to raise ethnic subjects rather than citizens aware of their basic rights. Writers such as Dubravka Ugrešić

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr Nataša Pantić, CITSEE Associate Researcher. Email: [natasa.pantic@gmail.com](mailto:natasa.pantic@gmail.com)

have examined how the violent break-up of Yugoslavia also quickly overthrew (in 'a culture of lies') the more worthy attempts to construct a multinational and multicultural community.

This paper examines the interactions between citizenship regimes and education policies in six post-Yugoslav post-conflict countries (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia). The CITSEE project has identified elements of ethnocentric, multiethnic and civic citizenship regimes in these states (Shaw and Štiks 2012:19-20). According to the most salient features of their constitutions and functioning, Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia have been qualified as ethnocentric citizenship regimes with a tendency of ownership of the state by the constituent ethnic nations (Deželan 2012; Koska 1012; Shaw and Štiks 2012; Vasiljević 2012). Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Kosovo have been characterised as multiethnic citizenship regimes, constructed as consociational states, largely as a result of external intervention or influence (Krasniqi 2012; Sarajlić 2012; Spaskovska 2012). The only civic citizenship regime has been identified in Montenegro, which does not have an ethnic majority (Džankić 2012; Shaw and Štiks 2012:20).

In almost all the post-Yugoslav countries, CITSEE studies have found a practice of ethnic engineering in the creation of new independent citizenship regimes. The practice of ethnic engineering is described as the intentional policy of governments and lawmakers to influence the ethnic composition of their population in favour of their dominant ethnic group (Shaw and Štiks 2012:16). This practice can be legally codified (as in the Serbian constitution defining Serbia as the state of Serbs and others), and/or it can be pursued through various institutional and administrative practices set within or against the existing laws. Even the civic citizenship of Montenegro can be seen as beneficial to only one group (the most numerous but not a majority) and at the same time intolerant towards dual citizenship of its own citizens and potential new citizens (Shaw and Štiks 2012:20).

Education is, of course, one of the public spheres in which ethnic engineering can be a powerful tool of favouritism of ethnic core groups and the exclusion of others. Political socialisation of citizens is one of the functions of education (Gutmann 1987:15); who belongs to the state, nation or homeland, and why, is often implied in ideologies, narratives and beliefs that can be officially or unofficially endorsed through education policies, curricula and practices. Some of the methods in which inclusive or exclusive concepts of citizenship can be promoted include education system structures, the use of languages in schools, and overt or hidden curricula (Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta, Schwille 2002).

Central to the exercise of full membership in a society are citizens' rights and duties. In their education-related legislation and policies all post-Yugoslav countries have incorporated provisions protecting rights to and in education. The countries are signatories to a number of European and other international instruments that protect individual rights, as well as grant various group rights, such as cultural and linguistic minority rights in education. For example, the UN Convention on the

Rights of the Child grants individuals the right to equal access to compulsory and free primary education, free access to secondary education including financial support for exercise of this right where needed, and stipulates that higher education should be accessible to all on the basis of capacity (Art. 28). The key instrument protecting minority rights, including in education, is the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM), which covers education on culture, language, history and the religion of minorities (Art. 12-14). Some of the studies conducted within the CITSEE project have already identified over-emphasis of group over individual rights (Krasniqi 2012; Sarajlić 2012; Spaskovska 2012). Studies from the region (Pantić, Closs and Ivošević 2011) and other Central and Eastern European countries (Agarin and Brosig 2009), point to the tensions between upholding ethnic and linguistic minority rights and developing inclusive education systems while respecting diversity. The upholding of rights to a culturally sensitive curriculum and schooling in the mother tongue, has sometimes inadvertently led to segregated education in some countries. Although most countries have begun to end the segregation of Roma and pupils with special education needs, other forms of segregation relating to the armed conflicts between 1991-1995, are still a major challenge (Pantić, Closs and Ivošević 2011).

This paper focuses on educational rights and explores whether groups are favoured over individuals in their entitlements to these rights, how the ethnocentric, multicultural and civic elements of citizenship operate in education systems and policies, and the extent to which education policies encourage inclusive or exclusive concepts of citizenship, officially or otherwise.

## **1. Possible interactions between citizenship regimes and education policies**

The interactions between citizenship regimes and education policies are analysed applying three sets of interpretative frameworks that distinguish between three dimensions of national identity and citizenship:

- 1) Collective vs. individual identities
- 2) Ethnocentric, multicultural, and civic elements in interactions between citizenship and education
- 3) Inclusive vs. exclusive concepts of national identity and citizenship

### ***1.1. Collective vs. individual identities***

According to Joppke (2003; 2007) citizenship is essentially membership in a polity to which rights and identities are connected. The rights dimension of citizenship includes social rights, protection from discrimination and multicultural recognition. Anti-discrimination measures attempt to remove ethnicity or race as a marker of individual and group differentiation, whereas recognition seeks to perpetuate such differentiation (Joppke 2007: 43). Citizenship as identity refers to individuals' acting

and conceiving of themselves as members of a collective, or the normative conceptions of such acting and conceiving propagated by the state. According to Joppke (2007:44), citizenship as identity has two possible meanings - the official views propagated by the state, and the actual views held by ordinary people, which can differ. Both are relevant for considering interactions with education policies.

One of the aims of education is to prepare citizens for civic participation and interaction with the state by developing their individual and collective identities (Bieber 2007; Čorkalo Biruški and Ajduković 2008; Gutmann 1987; Spiecker and Steutel 1995). Education for citizenship can also be seen at two levels: policy or social, and the individual level (Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta and Schwille 2002). At the social level, education is often seen as political socialisation - typically understood to include processes by which states transmit political values and modes of behaviour to citizens, which can also be unintended processes (Gutmann 1987:15). At the individual level, education for citizenship is a process by which collective identifications are given private and personal meanings (Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta and Schwille 2002).

This study focuses on the interaction between citizenship regimes and the policy or social level of education for citizenship promoted by the state. Nevertheless, we need to bear in mind that, for better or worse, individuals acquire knowledge and internalise values only partly through what is present at the broader, societal level. Although the individual level is not the focus of this study, we will illustrate this point with studies on the attitudes of students, parents, and teachers.

## *1.2. Ethnocentric, multicultural and civic interactions between citizenship and education*

We draw on Gutmann's (1987) theories of 'a family state', 'a state of families' and 'a state of individuals' to define the ethnocentric, multicultural, and civic elements sought in the assumed (desired) relations between the collective and the individual in post-Yugoslav states.

### *1.2.1. Ethnocentric education for ethnocentric citizenship in 'a family state'*

The defining feature of the family state (Gutmann, 1987:23) is that it claims exclusive educational authority as the means of establishing a constitutive relation between individuals and the social good based on knowledge. The family state seeks to create a level of unity and like-mindedness among its citizens (that can be expected only in families, and perhaps not even there) based on its status as the "political" parent of its citizens. The purpose of education is to cultivate such unity among its citizens by defining and transmitting educationally worthwhile knowledge.

Ethnocentric citizenship regimes seek to affirm an ethnic majority as the dominant conception of nationhood in a given country, which according to Joppke (2003; 2007) has little in common with the legal form of citizenship. In an



ethnocentric version of the family state ethnic belonging comes forth as the defining feature of citizens' identity aligned with the idea of collective (ethnic) good. The purpose of education for the ethnocentric concept of citizenship would, then, be to prepare citizens to think of themselves within the framework of their ethnicity under which their individual ideas of a good life are to be subsumed. Some of the methods for building the ethnocentric nation state through education include establishing a state language and promoting a unified, homogenised historical narrative (Bieber 2007) by controlling the sources of knowledge considered valid by the education authorities.

### *1.2.2. Multicultural education for multicultural citizenship in 'a state of families'*

The family state's claim of an exclusive authority over education might never be questioned in a society whose members already agree about what is good and educationally worthwhile. In multicultural societies such claims are bound to constrain the choices among different ways of life and educational purposes, in a manner that is not always compatible with parents' and citizens' cultural identities (Gutmann 1987:28). Radically opposed to the family state is the state of families, which places authority exclusively in the hands of parents to predispose their children, through education, to choose a way of life consistent with their familial heritage based on their cultural rights (Gutmann 1987:28).

Multicultural citizenship regimes adopt a conception of minority cultures that grants certain collective rights to such minorities, although no single formula can be applied to all groups (Kymlicka 1995). This entitlement has been challenged on the grounds that cultural community is a dynamic concept - centuries of contact will have had effects on the groups as they now exist (Tomasi 1995; Čorkalo Biruški and Ajduković 2008). Multiple identities and combining group and other identities are the norm in modern societies (Osler and Starkey 2001). According to Tomasi (1995:589) each individual has a dynamic cultural membership equally. Thus it cannot generate special rights. The provision of basic education is also an individual right, so we need to distinguish between the instantiation of the principle of universal and free basic education for every child, and the granting of special, group rights to students of different cultural groups. Multicultural education emphasises the need to preserve the specific cultures of minority groups, for example through linguistically and culturally sensitive curricula. To avoid the 'free-rider' problem and assure all children the freedom to choose in the future, the state of families limits parental supremacy by requiring schools to teach mutual respect (Gutmann 1987:32). Čorkalo Biruški and Ajduković (2008:190) argue that multicultural education should try to encourage intercultural dialogue and social integration.

### *1.2.3. Civic education for civic citizenship in 'a state of individuals'*

In the civic understanding of nationhood and citizenship, these are territorial constructs connected to the states' obligations to individuals based on international law (e.g. protection of human rights and non-discrimination), and a de-coupling of the state from nation-building (Joppke 2003:437). As in the family of states, in civil society many loyalties and affiliations are tolerated or encouraged (including family, cultural and religious denominations), but cultural difference appears through individual rather than through group rights (Joppke 2007:43). In the state of individuals (Gutmann 1987:33) a desired educational authority is the one that maximizes future choices without prejudicing children towards any conceptions of a good life. At the same time, it recognises the impracticability of neutrality in education and seeks to prepare its citizens for membership in a society committed to a 'conscious social reproduction' by collective decision-making, which includes the question of what values to promote in education.

This civic conception of education adopts Rawls' conception of citizenship in a constitutional democracy, which regards its citizens as free and equal (Spiecker and Steutel 1995). According to Rawls (1993:30) two layers of citizens' identity can be distinguished: a political identity based on the rights and duties of sustaining fair social cooperation over time, and citizens' 'deeper aims and commitments' - their non-institutional, moral identity. Citizens must adjust and reconcile these two aspects of their identity in order to affirm the values of justice and see them embodied in political institutions. Spiecker and Steutel (1995) argue that the only education for citizenship where governmental control can be considered legitimate is when it refers to their political identity. Its task is to prepare citizens to take on their fair share of the responsibility for maintaining equal rights, the principles of justice, and equality of opportunity. Children need to become cooperating members of society, ready to 'propose fair terms of cooperation it is reasonable to expect others to endorse', and be 'willing to abide by these terms provided others can be relied on to do likewise' (Rawls 1993:81; Spiecker and Steutel 1995).

### *1.3. Inclusive vs. exclusive concepts of national identity and citizenship*

The CITSEE project conceptualises citizenship regimes as encompassing inter alia the 'official' or 'unofficial' ideology of inclusion or exclusion (Shaw and Štiks 2010:6). The European Commission (2004) defines social inclusion as a process that provides people exposed to the risk of poverty and social exclusion with the opportunity and means for full participation in economic, social and cultural life of the society in which they live. There is a distinction to be made between peaceful coexistence of differences in society ensuring the welfare of all its members, and the capacity of a society to minimise disparities and avoid polarisation, referred to as social cohesion (McGinn 2008:291). The concept of social cohesion is interpreted differently in various contexts - as shared norms and values; a sense of shared identity or

belonging to a common community; a society providing collective welfare and equitable distribution of rights, opportunities and wealth. A distinctive feature of social cohesion is that it involves harmonious inter-community relations and trust (Green et al. 2003). Green and his colleagues (2003) suggest that education can affect social cohesion through socialisation (inculcation of values and attitudes conducive to social cohesion via a curriculum/school ethos), distributing opportunities and enhancing the skills useful for building communities (such as cross-cultural understanding and civic participation). According to Gutmann (1987) social diversity enriches individuals by extending their understanding of different ways of life. Thus, children are exposed to ways of life different from those of their parents (p. 33) through intercultural contact and interaction (such as learning with and about others, learning the different languages of fellow citizens, and cooperation in curricular and extra-curricular activities).

The extent to which inclusive or exclusive concepts of national identity and citizenship are encouraged in education policies is recognised in how they promote human rights and shared values, make positive references to cultural diversity, and the ways they conceptualise minorities. By contrast, exclusion is reflected in discrimination against groups or individuals (by ethnicity, mother tongue, social class, religion and so on), intolerance and preventing full participation, and the support (either overt or tacit) of us and them attitudes (Osler and Starkey 2001, p. 292).

## **2. Areas of analysis: education systems, language policies and curricula**

Education for citizenship is ubiquitous. It can be taught as a special subject or across the curriculum (in history, geography, and literature). It is also reflected in school and class organisation, in extra-curricular activities (Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta and Schwille 2002) and in broader education and other related policies (IEA 1995). Education for citizenship is specified as one of the desired educational goals of the 'intended curriculum' embodied in official documents. However, relying on these professed policies is likely to be insufficient, especially where societies have recently undergone profound transformations in which young people are being prepared for a citizenship order that is shifting (Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta and Schwille 2002:4). It is thus important to look also at the broader contexts in which education takes place.

The policy or societal level of education for citizenship includes political and legal processes and institutions, narratives deemed important at the national or local level, a country's international position, and social stratification (Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta and Schwille 2002:7-8). The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement sets the contextual framework for studies of education for citizenship (IEA 1995), which includes the level of the wider community (i.e. the wider context within which schools work). At this level, data was collected on the structure of the education system, policies related to and curriculum

approaches to citizenship education, and the extent of current debates and reforms in this area (IEA 1995:22).

In this study the three interpretative frameworks described above are applied to three areas of analysis: 1) the structures of the education systems, 2) relevant education policies (language policies in particular), and 3) related curricular arrangements. The ongoing reforms are not systematically explored for the purpose of this study, but references are made to reform efforts where they have been found. Thus, this study aims at understanding the interactions between citizenship regimes and education by unpacking the assumptions underpinning education system structures, language and curricula policies. Understanding these assumptions can illuminate the preferred links between individuals and the state encompassing inter alia, the official or unofficial ideologies of inclusion or exclusion, and collective and individual rights.

### *2.1. Citizenship and education system structures*

The illuminative and interpretative approaches to the study of citizenship adopted by the CITSEE project require a consideration of the complex range of interrelated influences - political, institutional, social, historical, cultural, and so on (Scheppele 2004: 399). Such influences intersect in the education sector – a battle for the hearts and minds of future generations. However, it is common for education studies to focus entirely on schooling (Gutmann 1987). Indeed, education for citizenship is to a large extent implicit in students' everyday experiences in their classrooms (e.g. in the degree of openness to discussion) and schools (e.g. in school cultures and levels of students' and parents' participation in school life) (IEA 1995; Pavlović 2006). However, a number of authors, including Gutmann (1987), remind us that there is much more to education than schooling. For example, Morgan (2005:394) argued that in Yugoslavia an attempt to influence individuals was coordinated through all social media – e.g. educational institutions, media outlets, art and culture. For Hemon 'a system of education is a system of expectations' (2012:7). Gutmann (1987) suggests that an understanding of how a society shapes its future citizens through education needs to look beyond schooling to the central political question of how authority over educational institutions is allocated.

In line with these suggestions we start the inquiry into the interactions between citizenship regimes and education by looking at the structures of education systems. Specifically we look at the different ways individuals may be incorporated in a state, universally or consociationally (Tomsí 1995:581), reflected in the countries' system of education and secondly, the way minorities are defined and provided for at different levels in the education system.

According to Brubaker (2007) a national minority is a dynamic political stance with variable assertions of collective cultural or political rights, which can range from full cooperative participation in the institutions of a host state to a non-cooperative stance seeking patronage from a kin state (Brubaker 2007:60-61). We can look at

whether ethno-linguistic cultures are understood as constitutive of nationhood and citizenship and correspondingly promoted in education. We also note that there is no blueprint for an ideal education system in a diverse society - each system has to be seen as relational, 'situated at the meeting point of majority, minority and the state' (Bieber 2007:16).

## *2.2. Citizenship and language policies in education*

Language policy is another relevant unit of analysis for the inquiry into interactions between citizenship and education policies. Such policies are relevant for the future patterns of language use by generations of children whose linguistic repertoires are shaped by their education (Kymlicka and Patten 2003:21). A number of options exist for policy makers: a single language as the main medium of public education, a single language of instruction with transitional bilingualism, or a concerted effort to use both majority and minority languages for instruction. These options can be offered on the basis of universality or territoriality, the promotion of individual vs. collective rights, tolerance or promotion, and 'norm-and-accommodation' or recognition principles (Kymlicka and Patten 2003).

Universality means that citizens should enjoy the same set of language rights no matter where they are in a country, while the territoriality principle means that the availability of options depends on their geographical region. Individual rights are the rights everyone in a given jurisdiction has, irrespective of the particular language group to which they belong, while collective (group-differentiated) rights can be exercised only by members of designated language groups. Individual rights can be claimed irrespective of the numbers of co-linguists residing in a jurisdiction, while collective rights depend on some threshold level of demand for a service. Tolerance rights protect individuals against government interference with their private language choices, while promotion-oriented rights involve the use of particular languages by public institutions, including public schools. In the 'norm-and-accommodation' approach to language policies, the key priority is to enable communication between public institutions and citizens or residents with limited proficiency in the language in public use, so that the latter can access the rights to which they are entitled. The recognition approach is to designate certain selected languages as 'official' and then to accord a series of rights to speakers of those languages, often connected with their recognition as a distinct nation or people.

Like the structures of education systems, regimes based on linguistic group rights are to be considered within country contexts, for example with a view to their contribution to citizens' social mobility, interethnic trust and social cohesion (Kymlicka and Patten 2003). Minority language policies can be considered with a view to their contribution to providing access to education for people in their own language, promotion of minority identity, social inclusion, and the majorities' awareness of diversity (Bieber 2007).

### ***2.3. Citizenship and (hidden) curriculum***

The intended links between a state and its citizens is made most explicit in the intended curriculum. As a third unit of analysis the present study looks into the curricular arrangements that are relevant for establishing linkages between citizenship regimes and the knowledge made available (or not) to students (Apple 2004). These arrangements might involve the selection of compulsory and optional curricular units relevant for education for citizenship. Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta and Schulle (2002:18) identify three different policy options for civic education as part of the intended curriculum: civics as a separate subject matter, the non-existence of civic education as a separate subject, and teaching of civics in other established school subjects such as history, or in a combination of subject matters, most typically history, religion, language and literature, and geography. Apple (2004) reminds us that it is also important to look at how these curricular arrangements evolved, and whether there are any latent contradictions for the future.

Here we look at the arrangements for education for citizenship as a separate school subject or across curriculum, and in policies relevant for textbooks in minority languages, asking what is perceived as legitimate knowledge and whether inclusive or exclusive concepts of citizenship are promoted through these arrangements. The present study explores the intended curriculum (e.g. policy documents defining areas of curriculum) rather than the implemented curriculum (e.g. actual practices in schools or the learning contents). Nevertheless, it discusses the implications of the so-called 'hidden' curriculum (i.e. where it is transmitted through institutional and systemic educational contexts) in light of the findings about the other two areas of analysis.

### ***2.4. Data collection and interpretation***

A qualitative comparative methodology is used in the study looking for cross-cutting themes that can be illustrated by all or some of the country cases. The data is collected mainly through analysis and close textual interpretation (Merriam 1998) of education policy documents, as well as in some informal interviews with the members from academia, governmental and non-governmental sectors. The data was drawn from both primary sources (laws, by-laws, national strategies, policy documents, guidance and other material) and secondary sources, such as evaluations by NGOs and international organisations where they exist. Data analysis involved the application of the three sets of interpretative frameworks (collective/individual; civic/multicultural/ethnocentric; inclusive/exclusive) to the three areas of analysis (system structures; language policies; curricular areas), and to the six country contexts of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia. The interpretative approach involved determining meaning, salience and connections (Ritchie and Spencer 1994), identifying 'themes' by looking at the logics

of particular country contexts as part of a wider regional context (Scheppelle 2004), and verifying conclusions with informants (Miles and Huberman 1994).

### **3. Citizenship and the structure of the education system(s)**

The cross-country themes (looking at the system structures and the way minorities are defined and provided for), include the distinction between universal and consociational education system(s), the context-dependent status of different minorities, and the ways education perpetuates the dominance of particular ethnic groups at different levels.

#### ***3.1. Universal vs. consociational education systems***

Some of the ways in which citizenship regimes operate in the education relate to how the countries define minorities (e.g. as 'nationalities', 'communities' and '(constitutive) peoples'). These definitions relate to the arrangements for (minority) rights to and in education. While the six states grant universal access to primary and secondary education, in some this right is de facto exercised consociationally by some 'minorities'. For example, in their constitutions Croatia and Serbia define themselves as countries of the Croat and Serb majority respectively, and of 'national minorities'. In these countries the national minorities are granted certain group (linguistic and cultural) rights within one centrally governed system of education. Montenegro's civic constitution (although it does not define the country's majority) also grants all 'members of minorities' a right to public education in their language with one central curriculum sensitive to minority cultures and their histories (Art. 79).

In contrast, examples of the consociationally exercised right to education are found in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with special arrangements for a linguistically and culturally sensitive education of the three 'constitutive peoples', who are also de facto minorities in parts of the country, along with other minorities. In Kosovo, members of the Serb 'community' are educated in a parallel system managed by the Serbian Ministry of Education. In Macedonia the Albanian 'community' exercises the right to education in a separate system of schools and classes in the Albanian language.

The granting of the status of 'communities' or 'peoples' to the former 'nationalities' is in some countries at the same time referred to as upgrading to a more appropriate arrangement in multicultural contexts (Angelovska and Skenderi 2009), and criticised for leading to ethnic distance among school children, due to the misinterpretation of the rights of communities (MESRM 2009). We will discuss later how intentionally multicultural policies at the same time support exclusive and ethnocentric concepts of citizenship.

### *3.2. Context-dependent status of different minorities*

A variety of arrangements for the education of different minorities can be found in the region, ranging from the noted cases of separate education systems for some minorities (or 'communities' and 'peoples') to those reducing minority identities to folk dances (Bieber 2007). Some commentators on minority policies in post-communist countries argue that in general the policies shifted from those of assimilation aimed at the desired socialist homogeneity to a greater concern for the protection of human and minority rights (Nikolić 2009). In some places such policies simultaneously served to reinforce the divides along ethnic identities, and sometimes led to segregation (Swimelar 2012). Different treatments of different 'minorities' in education can be linked to the post-conflict contexts, and to the history of minority protection and relations with kin states.

Fragmented, divided and politicised systems and institutions link to post-conflict contexts. Examples include post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina, ethnically divided Macedonia and Kosovo, and post-conflict areas within countries, such as the area of Vukovar in Croatia. Bosnia and Herzegovina has the most fragmented education system with 13 education ministries in the two entities, the ten Federation cantons, and the Brčko district. The right to a culturally and linguistically sensitive curriculum is mostly practised through mono-ethnic schooling of the constituent peoples. The most notorious examples are those of segregated schooling of Bosniak and Croat children in 'two schools under one roof' in which teachers and students of the two groups are physically separated (prevalent in the Central Bosnia and Herzegovina-Neretva Cantons). In Macedonia's linguistic (ethnic) separation of schools and classes (sometimes on pretext of violence prevention) Albanian students are reported to be most isolated, while students from non-Albanian ethnic communities attend schools in the Macedonian language (UNICEF 2009). In Kosovo's heavily politicised education system other non-Albanian communities are caught in a cross fire between the Albanian majority community and the Serb minority community which does not recognise the Kosovo authorities (Bieber 2007).

Segregated schooling for some minorities does not always imply that students are disadvantaged in terms of post school opportunities. In some cases, linguistically separate education for some minorities can mean that pupils enjoy an advantage in terms of support from and mobility towards kin states for higher education. These cases link to the history of some nationalities (*narodnosti* in Yugoslavia) that enjoyed substantial autonomy and minority rights in education. For example, Italian schools in Istria have been found to have more favourable student-teacher ratios than an average number of students per class in Croatia overall, and to be better equipped thanks to financial support from Italy (Pantić, Closs and Ivošević, 2011). Similarly, the Hungarian minority in Serbia inherited high levels of autonomy with entitlement to education in their language from primary through to university education. This is especially the case in Vojvodina where minority protection is generally reported to



be higher than in Serbia proper, with National Councils representing minorities more systematically consulted in education matters (Bieber 2007; OSCE 2008).

Specific treatment is evident in all countries with a Roma minority, for whom being a minority often coincides with a low socio-economic condition. The segregation and exclusion of sometimes extremely impoverished Roma children is reported across the region (Bieber 2007). Drop-out rates are significantly higher among Roma, who are often educated in schools and classes for children with special needs. For example, in 2007 special classes in Serbia were attended by 50-80% Roma students (Bieber 2007:63). In Bosnia and Herzegovina, poverty was identified as the main cause for the low number of Roma pupils in the education system (Bieber 2007:39).

In the recent reforms of their education systems all countries have introduced affirmative measures to target inclusion and desegregation of Roma in education. These measures often support anti-discriminatory practices rather than promoting recognition of the cultural and linguistic rights of the Roma minority, which does not neatly link to a culture or language, and has often been found to be in greater need of resource redistributive measures than of cultural recognition (Agarin and Brosig 2009). All six countries joined the Decade of Roma Inclusion (2005-15) and developed action plans to improve access and bring Roma children into regular education through the introduction of Roma assistants in schools, providing free textbooks and scholarships, and expanding pre-school attendance, usually implemented in cooperation with NGOs (Pantić, Closs and Ivošević 2011). Sometimes these reform measures removed barriers for access to education of Roma children, for example by allowing enrolment without proof of parents' residence in the new legislation in Serbia (ZOSOV 2009). Sometimes measures targeting Roma students have contributed to building anti-discriminatory educational practices more generally, for example through use of handbooks supporting anti-discriminatory school cultures (Pantić, Closs and Ivošević 2011).

In a study of the integration of Roma in Macedonia, Nikolić (2009:286-7) remarked that the majority of ethnic Macedonians 'do not perceive Roma as intimidating or threatening when put in the context of the persistent tensions with the much larger and politically stronger Albanian majority'. This might explain why it is politically less controversial to embrace policies aimed at including the Roma minority than other, post-conflict minorities. Where examples of nascent conciliatory practices have been reported, they resulted from efforts of conscientious teachers and school principals, in spite of, rather than in response to education policies (Pantić, Closs and Ivošević 2011).

### *3.3. The use of education to perpetuate the dominance of particular ethnic groups*

All the six countries use education in their ethnocentric nation-building projects, but the loci of ethnic engineering varies from the national level (Croatia, Montenegro and

Serbia) to varying degrees of decentralisation of the education authorities (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo and Macedonia).

In the states with one dominant constitutive majority, the ethnic, cultural and linguistic interests of the 'state-bearing' group are embedded in the design of policies and institutions. For example, in Croatia and Serbia the constitutions establish the state language and script, and policies promote a homogenised narrative most obviously through the national curricula. The central management of the education systems in these countries allows high levels of control of the educationally 'valid' knowledge by the education authorities at the national level. Thus, young citizens learn almost exclusively about the majority group's narrative, history, culture and religion, while minorities usually seek to secure their group's linguistic and cultural rights in education. Their levels of success and involvement of the bodies representing a given minority in curricular design vary, depending on the group's integrity, stability, political clout, and relations with kin states.

While education reforms in all the six countries included strategies for the transfer of some authorities in education to the school level, in the consociational systems, the powers were also transferred to the lower levels of education authorities such as entities and cantons in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and municipalities in Macedonia and Kosovo. Proponents of group rights recognise decentralisation and autonomy for local authorities in education as a positive force allowing groups to practice and protect their cultural identity, language, and religion (Kymlicka 1995). However, in these post-conflict contexts, the decentralisation of educational authority has often meant greater power for local nationalists and less involvement by school staff, parents and students. In some cases, as in Bosnia and Herzegovina, pressure and/or manipulation from administrators and authorities is said to have resulted in parents themselves pushing for educational segregation (Swimelar 2012).

Multicultural states' constitutions and legislation often provide that lower level authorities shall respect certain nationally set standards while using their local powers. The Kosovo constitution obliges municipalities to respect the constitution and the applicable legislation in the areas of their own competencies including those in education (Art. 124). In Macedonia, the so-called 'Badinter majority' applies for laws that concern the use of languages and education. In other words, the Assembly adopts decisions by the majority of votes that is constituted from the present members, provided that the majority of votes comes from MPs who are members of communities that are not a majority in the state (Angelovska and Skenderi 2009). However, at the local level, dominant groups – be they majority or minority – are reported to often make decisions with little consultation with others (Bieber 2007). In these contexts decentralisation brings both opportunities for multicultural recognition and risks of discrimination against other groups or individuals due to doubtful local capacities, or simply due to local authorities not using their legal mandates to deal with daily school issues. For example, in Macedonia, school boards of mixed composition are reported to have had very little involvement in dealing with issues related to interethnic communication under their legal mandate (UNICEF

2009). Intercultural solutions in day-to-day interactions between individuals with various cultural, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds remain a challenging task for schools in some places. In Kosovo, numerous attempts made by local and international bodies to develop educational cooperation between Serb and Albanian communities have failed, despite the report of 'general openness to discussion of all issues by school principals and teachers' (Rexhaj, Mula, and Hima 2010:35).

#### **4. Citizenship and language policies in education**

Language policies are some of the most frequently employed mechanisms to promote inclusive/exclusive concepts of citizenship in education. Legislation in the region provides a number of language instruction options. Minority language instruction is mostly available as a given group right.

##### ***4.1. Various language policy options***

In most cases the six states have opted for the promotion and recognition of principles of linguistic rights, incorporated in constitutions, legislation and other statutory and policy documents. The Kosovo constitution stipulates that members of communities have the right, individually or in community, to receive public education at all levels in one of the official languages, and to use their language and alphabet freely in private and in public (Art. 59). In their legislation, the six countries provide different models for the implementation of linguistic rights in education. For instance, Serbian legislation (ZOSOV 2009) affirms the practice of education of minorities in their first language in all subjects, and only in exceptional cases bilingually or in the Serbian language. In Croatia, the Constitutional Act on the Rights of National Minorities (2002) grants national minorities the right to education in their first language and script in pre-school, primary and secondary education. Minorities exercise this right through one of three models: model A foresees schooling in the national minority language and four hours of Croatian a week; model B envisages bilingual teaching, with the social sciences and humanities taught in the minority language and natural sciences taught in the Croatian language, again with four hours of Croatian a week; and model C enables nurturing of the mother tongue and minority culture through five hours per week of instruction in the given minority language (Batarelo-Kokić, Vukelić and Ljubić 2010).

The choices of some 'linguistic minorities' clearly link to post-conflict contexts. For example, in the area of Vukovar in Croatia – where the Serb minority opted for model A (education in their own language) – Croat and Serb students were separated in different schools or shifts until September 2007, despite the five-year limit for this arrangement established by the Erdut Agreement in 1995. In Macedonia any community constituting 20% or more of the population of a municipality has the right to education in their mother tongue at all levels, pursuant to the Ohrid Framework Agreement that sets an agenda for increased participation in public life,

primarily by ethnic Albanians. The Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina and especially the Interim Agreement on Satisfying Special Needs and Rights to Returnee Children (2002) guarantee special rights in education to the members of any of the three constituent peoples forming a minority in areas that are predominantly populated by the members of another constituent people (Kafedžić, Džemidžić-Kristiansen and Pribišev Beleslin 2010:32). According to Swimelar (2012), Croats, more than other groups, have pressed for linguistic and cultural rights partly due to feeling outnumbered in post-war Bosnia.

In these contexts, separate education for accommodating linguistic rights is based on the territoriality principle, and in actual fact on an ethnic ground. Many of the claims to group rights are politically motivated, and may be less about the practicality of language use and communication, and more about the symbolic nature of language as a key to one's history and identity (Swimelar 2012). This might explain the prevalence of the recognition over the norm-and-accommodation principle in language policies in education. Montenegro is an interesting case in this regard, with the recognition principle built into the Constitution, yet with the norm-and-accommodation principle applied in the implementation of linguistic rights. The Constitution stipulates the official use of Serbian, Bosnian, Albanian, and Croatian languages along with Montenegrin (Art. 13). In practice, education in one's own language is provided only for the Albanian minority for whom communication would not be possible in Montenegrin due to the degree of linguistic difference. This is not the case for the other official languages commonly referred to as 'the mother tongue' (Bieber 2007; Milić, Marić, Bošković and Šćepović, 2010; VRCG 2005). Recently, heated debates over the name of this common language produced a composite name for the school subject called Montenegrin-Serbian, Bosnian and Croatian Language and Literature.

Language is in some cases both a real and a politicised question. The degree of linguistic difference between languages has implications for possible intercultural cooperation between segregated schools and classes. For example, given willingness on the part of school staff and a given local community, such cooperation is easily practicable, e.g. for Bosniak and Croat students in Bosnia and Herzegovina or between Croat and Serb students in schools in Vukovar (Croatia), while intercultural cooperation between Albanian and Serb schools in Kosovo would require the mutual learning of languages.

#### *4.2. Availability of minority language education*

Discrepancies are noticeable between learning the minority languages by the majorities and vice versa. For example, Macedonia introduced the learning of the Macedonian language for non-Macedonian students from grade one, while the introduction of local languages for Macedonian students is withheld (UNICEF 2009). Learning a minority language is often challenging, especially if it is not the language

of an economically or culturally attractive kin state or a foreign language with greater allure, like English (Bieber 2007).

The option of education in the first language is usually provided, pending on a threshold number of students, favouring territoriality over the universal principle, and group over individual rights. All six countries (except Croatia) have established a requirement for a minimum number of students for establishing specific classes or schools for a minority (lower than normally stipulated for educational institutions). For example, in Serbia education in a minority language is granted for a minimum of 15 students or upon a request and with approval by the Minister for fewer than 15 pupils. Sometimes, the legislation is not precise about threshold numbers, like in Kosovo, although the application of a threshold of 15 in practice has been reported (Bieber 2007:52).

According to Bieber (2007:71) imprecise definitions of numbers sometimes contribute to poor implementation of rights to education in minority languages. For example Bosnia's Framework Law on Primary and Secondary Education (2003) provides that "The language and culture of any major minority living in Bosnia and Herzegovina shall be respected and shall fit into schools to the largest extent viable, in line with the Framework Convention on Protection of Rights of Ethnic Minorities" (Art. 8). The provision is then integrated in various forms into the entity and cantonal legislation. For example, in Tuzla Canton Law on Minorities (2009) different thresholds apply for different modes of provision: 1/3 of a total number of pupils in a school for instruction in the mother tongue, and 1/5 of a total number of pupils in a school for additional classes of the minority language, literature, history, geography and culture, if this is requested by the majority of their parents (Art. 8). Republika Srpska had a threshold of 20 pupils that it abolished in 2004 upon the FCNM Advisory Committee's criticism that it was too high. Subsequently, local authorities are obliged to organise additional classes in a minority language, history and culture regardless of student numbers.

In reality, however, most schools function under a mono-ethnic curriculum given that most geographical units are themselves mono-ethnic, with minority student numbers usually too small for entitlement for curriculum in their language, or to form their own school. Thus, in most parts of Sarajevo where Bosniaks are the majority, the schools use the Bosniak curriculum, while in Banja Luka, Republika Srpska students learn from the Serb curriculum. In some cases, if a teacher can be found and if there are enough students, separate classes for the group of 'national subjects' is created. It is also common that many Bosnian Serb parents living in Sarajevo send their children across the inter-entity boundary to Republika Srpska so that they can attend a school following the curriculum in Serbian, even if the quality of education is lower and the distance greater, and even if children have to walk considerable distances along main roads (Swimelar 2012).

The numerical threshold provisions inevitably limit the geographical scope of the right to education in a minority language - an Albanian speaker in Macedonia might be able to learn Albanian in Tetovo, but not in Štip (Bieber 2007:16). These

provisions also contribute to differences in the actual exercise of the right to education in one's own language by different minorities, notably withdrawal of such a right to less numerous, or less vocal ones. Sometimes, the right to culturally and linguistically sensitive curriculum is denied on the pretext of 'technical limits' and lack of resources (teachers, textbooks, financing). Shortages of minority teachers are often due to their being trained abroad in kin states (Bieber 2007:68), or for other context specific reasons. For example, the guarantee in the Use of Languages in Kosovo Act (2002) protecting the right of minorities to be educated in their own languages, is implemented for Turkish, Bosnian and part of Gorani community (who attend schools in the Bosnian language), while Serbs and part of Gorani who attend schools in the Serbian language, follow curricula from Serbia. Serbia offers full education in Hungarian, but only limited courses in Romani. In Macedonia Albanian, Turkish, Macedonian and Serbian languages are available as languages of instruction, while Roma, Bosniaks and Vlachs are offered optional subjects in their languages. The right to education is most often denied to the Roma minority whose members are as a rule educated in the language of the majority in the place where they reside. Thus, in Croatia, Roma attend classes in the Croatian language; in Kosovo, Roma who live in a predominantly Albanian environment attend school in Albanian, while Roma who live in Serbian enclaves attend Serbian language schools (Bieber 2007).

In post-war Balkan geographies the claims of collective linguistic rights potentially lead to exclusion and work at cross-purposes against universal human rights, civic ideals, non-discrimination and inclusion (Swimelar 2012). Language is a significant stumbling block to the promotion of inclusive concepts of citizenship, often used for maintaining separation and exclusion, as can be illustrated by the Mostar Gymnasium case. According to Hromadžić (2008) the international community initiated the integration of the Mostar Gymnasium (attended by Bosniak and Croat students), while the Croat political community claimed its cultural rights, and especially its linguistic rights. The school has been administratively unified, but preserved separate curricula and the ethnic segregation characteristic of the 'two schools under one roof'. Hromadžić (2008) shows through students' experiences how this kind of concurrently shared and separated schooling generates distrust among the young citizens in post-conflict Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In contrast to Mostar, the integration of schools in the Brčko district has been cited as an example of a concerted effort of the international community, education authorities, professionals and communities to overcome the divides along ethnic lines in education (OSCE 2007). In 2001 the Brčko Supervisor imposed the district level Law on Education and a newly developed curriculum. The law set a platform for integrated education by stipulating that students of the three ethnicities receive instruction in their own languages in the same classroom, and use the Latin and Cyrillic alphabets on equal terms in curricular and extracurricular activities. The law also stipulated that the ethnic composition of teachers should reflect that of the students in a school. A comprehensive public awareness campaign was run parallel

to policy measures obliging teachers to use all three languages when teaching, and to sign a Code of Conduct accepting the reform principles. Such policies were accompanied by incentives and an offer of short-term (annual and bi-annual) contracts to teachers in Brčko with a view towards ensuring sustained commitment to the reform principles. In the 2001/2002 school year children of the three ethnicities started to go to the primary schools together with some separate classes for the 'national subjects'. Integrated schooling of the secondary students was achieved gradually over four years (OSCE 2007).

A public opinion poll conducted in 2004 showed that parents in Brčko were more in favour of integrated schooling than parents in Bosnia and Herzegovina on average (OSCE 2007). The well-known 'contact thesis' put forth by Allport (1954), and noted by scholars of education in the region (Čorkalo Biruški and Ajduković 2008; Swimelar 2012), points to the importance of interpersonal contact for reducing prejudice and building tolerance. Ordinary citizens, including children and young people, seem to be aware of the importance of interethnic contact in education. A survey in Macedonia showed that the majority of citizens felt that education, alongside Macedonia's membership of the EU, is the most significant factor for improving interethnic relations in their municipality (Angelovska and Skenderi 2009). In a study of the perceptions of the role of education in reconciliation (Magill et al. 2009) young respondents from Bosnia and Herzegovina tended to emphasise the need for contact between schools with pupils of different ethnicities. A subsequent study of the attitudes of parents, teachers, and students towards separate education of Croats and Serbs in the Vukovar area showed more positive attitudes towards integration in 2007 than in 2001, although all groups, except the teachers of the curriculum in Croatian, were still mostly in favour of separate education (Čorkalo Biruški and Ajduković 2008).

In summary, although the language policies in the six states are broadly consistent with multicultural views of the need to grant cultural and linguistic group rights in education, there is only limited promotion of the mutual respect principle and interethnic contact, and limited individual choice of the language of instruction by both majorities and minorities. The problem with homogenising groups for policy purposes – even where there is a degree of interaction between the groups – is that interactions take place between individuals who classify each other exclusively in terms of belonging to specific ethnic or cultural communities. This has obvious implications for building cohesive societies.

## **5. Citizenship and (hidden) curricula**

Civic education has been introduced as a (cross-) curricular unit in line with the countries' professed aims of preparing citizens who are responsible, equal, critical, and respectful of others. However, ethnocentric concepts of citizenship can be discerned in other relevant school subject curricula, in textbooks, and especially as part of hidden curricular arrangements.

### *5.1. Education for citizenship as a (cross-) curricular unit*

Most of the countries have introduced civic education as a specific (compulsory or optional) curricular unit. This approach is usually combined with recognition (at least in policy documents) of the need to address education for citizenship across the curriculum through other relevant subjects and in extra-curricular activities, for instance in Montenegro (Vlada Crne Gore 2007) and Macedonia (MESRM 2009). In countries where education for citizenship is planned only as a cross-curricular component, as in Croatia recently (MZOŠ 2010), the need to introduce civic education as an explicit curricular unit has been discussed. Advocates of such an approach argue that pupils need to learn about democratic institutions, the constitution, and citizens' rights and duties.

Civic education sometimes has the status of a 'compulsory elective' on par with subjects like religious education or the history of religions, e.g. in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia. In some cases students and parents are 'helped' to make choices by timetable arrangements. For example, in Sarajevo Canton optional religious classes are organised in between other compulsory classes. In Serbia an unusual binary opposition between civic and religious education has established itself in the national curriculum over the last decade. While it is obligatory to attend one of these two curricular units that are arranged at the same time, parents have no option of enrolling their children in both. This arrangement was introduced in 2001/2002 as a result of a political deal, and is today seen by many as a choice between 'modern' and 'conservative' Serbia (Danas March 17-18, 2012).

Reviews and evaluations by international organisations (e.g. UNICEF 2009 in Macedonia; or Smith et al. 2002 in Serbia) and local NGOs (e.g. Gërbeshi and Tahiri 2010 in Kosovo) commend the contributions of the specific curricular units for citizenship education to raising students' capacities for civic participation in democracies. In Macedonia the related curricular units (Life-Skills-Based Education and elective subjects) are reported to also incorporate goals that promote multiculturalism and respect for cultural and ethnic differences (UNICEF 2009:6). At the same time, integration of such goals into other related subjects is criticised as being entirely left to the individual teachers' will, with history curricula described as the most problematic (UNICEF 2009:6). Such a situation is not surprising considering that in most countries civic education components of the curricula have been developed as add-on units based on the numerous programmes developed by NGOs, rather than as part of comprehensive strategies of civic education coherent with overall reforms of education systems and policies.

When there are possibilities to locally adapt the national curricula, they are mainly used for satisfying the rights of 'linguistic' minorities or 'communities'. In Montenegro the adaptation of 20% of the mainstream curriculum at the local (school) level is used for the inclusion of an Albanian language and literature class (Milić, Marić, Bošković and Šćepović 2010:37). In some countries this leeway is used for a so-called 'national group of subjects'. In Bosnia and Herzegovina the international



community and education authorities agreed on a 70% common curriculum, with 30% reserved for the different 'national subjects' including mother tongue and literature, geography, history, and religious instruction (Kafedžić, Džemidžić-Kristiansen and Pribišev Beleslin 2010:32). Integrated schools in the Brčko district have a higher percentage of common curricula and do not include geography among the 'national subjects' (OSCE 2007). For the Serb minority in the Vukovar area, these include language, history, geography, music and arts education (Čorkalo Biruški and Ajduković 2008). In these subjects students learn primarily with and about their ethnic group. This practice contributes to developing separate national identities along ethnic lines, with little knowledge about their co-citizens and their cultures (MESRM 2009).

### *5.2. Ethnocentric textbooks and stereotypes*

One of the main sources of ethnocentric education are textbooks that support ethnic engineering, rather than the development of a civic identity. In Macedonia varying proportions of content reflecting the multicultural reality of the country are found in textbooks for different school subjects (UNICEF 2009). In general, textbooks are reported to lack sufficient content, characters, pictures or authors to enable students to familiarize themselves with the culture and traditions of other ethnic communities, or to develop an understanding of what they share. This is sometimes due to the textbooks being imported from kin states with no reference to the state in which students live (Swimelar 2012).

According to Bieber (2007) although the former stereotypical portraits and examples of hatred from the 1990s have gradually been eliminated from textbooks, the bias towards ethnic majorities has been retained. Minority culture is often reported to be simply absent from textbooks (even those in their own languages). For example, in Croatia textbooks in minority languages are usually the translations or adaptations of the Croatian ones, as the textbooks in the Albanian language in Montenegro are translations of the Montenegrin ones, without references to minority cultures and traditions. The practice of importing textbooks in minority languages from the kin states has become more frequent (e.g. in Serbia and Kosovo), and results in a similar situation of minorities and majorities learning from different books without references to each other. The textbooks in the languages of some minorities (e.g. Roma, Bosniaks and Vlachs in Macedonia) are not produced due to too small a circulation to be viable for publishers (Bieber 2007:56).

Some efforts to remove stereotypes from textbooks have been made in the region, for example through the engagement of the international community and specifically the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Swimelar 2012). An important regional initiative to produce new history workbooks with different regional perspectives on some of the most controversial periods of Balkan history has been led by the Thessaloniki-based Centre for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe (CDRSEE). Since their

publication in 2004 the workbooks started to be used in Serbia, but were shelved after some historians said they were anti-Serb (Bieber 2007), and only regained the support of the Minister of education in 2010 (Prosvetni pregled, 23 September 2010). In other countries in the region the workbooks are 'not part of the regular programme ... but teachers have accepted it as additional teaching material' according to Nenad Šebek, CDRSEE'S programme director.

### *5.3. Education for citizenship as part of the hidden curricula*

The formal curriculum is one way to promote education for inclusive or exclusive concepts of citizenship, minority rights and interethnic relations. Equally important are the school culture, student-teacher relationships, whole-school approaches to empowerment as citizens and the sense of belonging to a community (Bieber 2007; Pavlović 2006). Although the curricula which are actually implemented fall outside the scope of this paper, some indication of the environment in which young citizens in the region are educated is provided by the described policies and institutional frameworks.

It seems that in many places in the region students are receiving mixed messages from civic education lessons and other relevant curricular areas, and most critically through hidden curricular practices. In Bosnia and Herzegovina schools are reported to be 'mono-ethnic, with pupils and teachers speaking only one language and using one alphabet depending on the ethnic and political affiliation of the local authorities' (Kafedžić, Džemidžić-Kristiansen and Pribišev Beleslin 2010:32). In addition to using different curricula, the 'two schools under one roof' also use 'linguistically' arranged shifts as mechanisms of segregation. Students and teachers use different entrances and different staff rooms and even have different break times. Thus, the students might be learning about the Bosnia and Herzegovina's multicultural composition and never see 'the others' going to the same school. Recently, the first court decision ruled that the segregation in 'two schools under one roof' is a violation of the Law against discrimination in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Static concepts of diversity and essentialised (ethnic) groups prevail in all countries giving primacy to group over individual rights, and anti-discrimination measures. Societies in the post-Yugoslav states, as in other countries, are stratified by different interrelated layers of diversity, e.g. living conditions in urban and rural environments, social and family cultures, ability and educational status, religious and secular views, gender, and so on. Which particular dimensions of diversity come to the forefront in public debate or rise to the top of policy agendas is guided by the political concerns of the moment and the context. In the region, education debates in the post-war period have been dominated by the issues of linguistic and cultural diversity and rights. However, many of the concerns about the quality of education and teachers, pupils' functional knowledge and employability, teaching and learning methods, are shared by all parents. The increasing presence of these substantive

issues in education debates and media might shift the foci of public pressure and the priorities of education authorities.

## 6. Conclusions

Education systems and policies have been instrumental in building and sustaining the current citizenship regimes across the post-Yugoslav countries. This working paper has illustrated how citizenship regimes operate in education system structures, language policies and curricular arrangements.

The six countries' education systems can be characterised as universal in that all countries grant the right of access to primary and secondary education to all citizens. They also grant certain linguistic and cultural group rights in education, which in some countries (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia and Kosovo) means that the universal right to education is de facto exercised consociationally. Arrangements are varied for different 'minorities', 'communities' and 'constitutive peoples'. As a rule, fragmented, divided and politicised systems link to the post-conflict contexts. For some minorities that inherited higher levels of protection and have closer relations with kin states (e.g. Hungarians in Serbia, and Italians in Croatia), separate education might mean that students are advantaged in terms of post school opportunities. The treatment of the Roma minority in all countries involves measures to increase access and prevent segregation. All countries use education for ethnocentric nation-building projects, but the loci of ethnic engineering vary from the national level (in Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia) to varying lower level education authorities (in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo and Macedonia).

In their language policies most of the countries have adopted the principles of promotion and recognition of linguistic rights in education, and provided a number of models for their implementation ranging from full instruction in people's own language to language and culture related classes. The choices of some 'linguistic minorities' are clearly linked to the post-conflict environment in which separate education that accommodates people's linguistic rights is based on the territoriality principle, and in the actual fact on an ethnic ground. Due to varying levels of linguistic differences, the issue of language is in some cases real, and in others only a politicised one. There are discrepancies between obligations of learning the minority languages by the majorities and vice versa. Policies of providing education in the first language depending on threshold numbers of students favour territoriality over the universal principle, as well as group over individuals' rights to culturally and linguistically sensitive curriculum. In the post-conflict contexts the primacy of group rights has created problematic multicultural solutions that can lead to minimal intercultural contact. Sometimes, rights to linguistically and culturally sensitive education are denied on the pretext of a lack of resources and teachers, although examples like Brčko show that such barriers can be removed by recruiting and training linguistically and culturally diverse teachers.

With regard to curriculum policies, most of the countries introduced civic education as a specific (compulsory or optional) curricular unit. However, these are rarely accompanied by the harmonisation of other relevant subject curricula and textbooks, although some efforts have been made to remove stereotypes from textbooks. Most critically, the messages students might be getting from hidden curricular practices (preventing intercultural contact and understanding) seem to serve the development of static concepts of diversity and essentialised (ethnic) groups, rather than civic identities.

Ethnocentric, multicultural and civic elements of citizenship regimes can be identified in the intended education policies, while the ethnocentric ones prevail in the ways policies are implemented. Civic elements can be recognised in the introduction of civic education as curricular units, multicultural policy options are most obvious in the recognition of the right to linguistically and culturally sensitive curricula, although ethnocentric motives can be discerned behind their territorial implementation, and in the arrangements for some minorities, communities and peoples in the systems of education. There is a strong emphasis on group rights, while there is no systematic monitoring of protection of individual human rights and non-discrimination practices. Attempts to make education more inclusive can be recognised in the improvements related to the inclusion of Roma in education, while exclusive conceptions of citizenship are reflected in the separate ethnic narratives promoted in relevant curricular areas, and in the hidden curricula preventing intercultural contact.

The prevailing understanding of mutual respect and acceptance of differences in education has been of limited effect in the region. Although inclusive values are mentioned in the normative frameworks, their application in practice is limited to the use of different languages in education. Even the language policies seem to be more of symbolic value than about genuine concern for citizens' cultural recognition and communication. On one hand classes and schools separate pupils linguistically even where there is an almost complete mutual understanding, as in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Croatia. On the other hand, there is little evidence of a genuine intention to ensure bilingual education where language does represent a real barrier for building inter-community trust, as in Kosovo and Macedonia. The 'linguistic' policies are often used to support the development of different ethnic identities, while examples of anti-discriminatory policies are rare (e.g. fighting discrimination against Roma by building inclusive institutions). Systematic mechanisms to ensure principles of mutual respect, and sanction disrespect of these principles at national and local levels, are yet to be developed.

In summary, the transformations of education for citizenship in these post-Yugoslav states are reminiscent of Grandpa Frost's ordeal: a desertion of the civic under the rise of ethnocentric, on the pretext of ensuring multicultural education of young citizens. Deda Mraz regained his rightful place in childhood following a local and international outcry. It remains to be seen what effects the education policies will have on the next generation of citizens in the region.

## References

- Agarin, T. and Brosig, M., eds. 2009. *Minority integration in Central and Eastern Europe: Between ethnic diversity and equality*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Allport, G. W., 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge: Perseus Books.
- Angelovska, E. and Skenderi, S., 2009. *Analysis of the interethnic relations in Republic of Macedonia*. Skopje: Zaednički vrednosti.
- Apple, M., 2004. *Ideology and Curriculum*. London: Routledge.
- Batarelo-Kokić, I., Vukelić, A. and M. Ljubić, 2010. *Mapping Policies and Practices for the Preparation of Teachers for Inclusive Education in Contexts of Social and Cultural Diversity*. Croatia Country Report. Turin: European Training Foundation. Accessed on 15 March 2012 at:  
[http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/C12578310056925BC125772E002BD5AB/\\$file/NOTE85SBD6.pdf](http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/C12578310056925BC125772E002BD5AB/$file/NOTE85SBD6.pdf)
- Bieber, F., ed. 2007. *Guide to Minorities and Education: Foundation of Stable Relations in the Region*. Civic Initiatives and the King Baudouin Foundation.
- Brubaker, R., 2007. *Nationalism reframed: Nationhood and the national question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Constitution of the Republic of Kosovo  
<http://www.kushtetutakosoves.info/repository/docs/Constitution.of.the.Republic.of.Kosovo.pdf>
- Čorkalo Biruški, D. and Ajduković D., 2008. Stavovi učenika, roditelja i nastavnika prema školovanju: što se promijenilo tijekom šest godina u Vukovaru? [Attitudes of students, parents and teachers towards schooling: what has changed in the course of six years in Vukovar?]. *Migracijske i etničke teme*, 24 (3), 189–216.
- Deželan, T., 2012. *In the name of the Nation or/and Europe? Determinants of the Slovenian citizenship regime*. CITSEE Working Paper, School of Law, University of Edinburgh.
- Džankić, J., 2012. *Understanding Montenegrin citizenship*. CITSEE Working Paper, School of Law, University of Edinburgh.
- European Commission, 2004. *Joint report on social inclusion*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Accessed 15 March 2012 at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/employment\\_social/social\\_inclusion/docs/final\\_joint\\_inclusion\\_report\\_2003\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/social_inclusion/docs/final_joint_inclusion_report_2003_en.pdf)

Gërbeshi, B. and Tahiri, P., 2010. *Concepts of Citizenship among Primary School Students in Kosovo*. Prishtina: Kosova Education Centre.

Green, A., Preston J. and R. Sabates, 2003. Education, equality and social cohesion: A distributional approach. *Compare*, 33(4), 453-70.

Gutmann, A., 1987. *Democratic Education*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Hemon, A., 2012. National subjects. *Guernica magazine*. January, 2012.

[http://www.guernicamag.com/features/3410/hemon\\_1\\_15\\_12/](http://www.guernicamag.com/features/3410/hemon_1_15_12/)

Hromadžić, A., 2008. Discourses of integration and practices of reunification at the Mostar gymnasium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, *Comparative Education Review*, 52(4), 541-64.

IEA (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement), 1995. *National Case Studies Final Guidelines*. Amsterdam: IEA ([www.iea.nl](http://www.iea.nl)).

Joppke, C., 2003. Citizenship between De- and Re- Ethnicization (I). *Arch. Europ. Social.*, XLIV (3), 429-458.

Joppke, C., 2007. Transformation of Citizenship: status, rights, identity. *Citizenship studies*, 11 (1), 37-48.

Kafedžić, L., Džemidžić-Kristiansen, S. and T. Pribišev-Beleslin, 2010. *Mapping Policies and Practices for the Preparation of Teachers for Inclusive Education in Contexts of Social and Cultural Diversity*. Bosnia and Herzegovina Country Report. Turin: European Training Foundation. Accessed on 15 March 2012 at: [http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/C12578310056925BC125772E002B2093/\\$file/NOTE85SB89.pdf](http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/C12578310056925BC125772E002B2093/$file/NOTE85SB89.pdf)

Koska, V., 2012. *Framing the citizenship regime within the complex triadic nexuses: The case study of Croatia*. CITSEE Working Paper, School of Law, University of Edinburgh.

Krasniqi, G., 2012. *Overlapping Jurisdictions, Disputed Territory, Unsettled State: The Perplexing Case of Citizenship in Kosovo*. CITSEE Working Paper, School of Law, University of Edinburgh.

Kymlicka, W. and Patten, A., 2003. Introduction: Language Rights and Political Theory. In W. Kymlicka and A. Patten, eds. *Language Rights and Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W., 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*Law on the Use of Languages*, 2002. Assembly of Kosovo, no. 02/L-37.

Magill, C., Smith, A. and B. Hamber, 2009. *The role of education in reconciliation: the perspectives of children and young people in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Northern Ireland*. Londonderry: University of Ulster.

McGinn, N.F., 2008. Education policies to promote social cohesion. In W. K. Cummings, and J. H. Williams, eds. *Policy-making for education reform in developing countries: Policy options and strategies*. Plymouth: Rowman and Littlefield.

Merriam, S. B., 1998. *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

MESRM, 2009. *Steps Towards Integrated Education in the Education System of the Republic of Macedonia*. Skopje: Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Macedonia.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman A. M., 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage.

Milić, T., Marić, A., Bošković, V. and V. Šćepović, 2010. *Mapping Policies and Practices for the Preparation of Teachers for Inclusive Education in Contexts of Social and Cultural Diversity*. Montenegro Country Report. Turin: European Training Foundation.

Accessed on 15 March 2012 at:

[http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/C12578310056925BC125772E002C7903/\\$file/NOTE85SBHH.pdf](http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/C12578310056925BC125772E002C7903/$file/NOTE85SBHH.pdf)

MZOŠ, 2010. Nacionalni okvirni kurikulum za predškolski odgoj i obrazovanje te opće obvezno i srednjoškolsko obrazovanje. [National Framework curriculum for elementary and secondary education]. Zagreb: Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i športa Republike Hrvatske.

Nikolić, S., 2009. Empowerment as a two-way process: The role of Romani NGOs in the integration of Macedonian society. In T. Agarin and M. Brosig, eds. *Minority integration in Central and Eastern Europe: Between ethnic diversity and equality*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

OECD, 2003. *Reviews of national policies for education: South Eastern Europe*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Okvirni zakon o osnovnom i srednjem obrazovanju, 2003. *Službeni glasnik BiH*, br. 18/03. [Framework Law on Primary and Secondary Education, *Official Gazette of BiH*, no. 18/03.

OSCE, 2002. *The Interim Agreement on Accommodation of Specific Needs and Rights of Returnee Children*. Sarajevo: Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

OSCE, 2007. *Lessons from Education Reform in Brčko*. A report prepared by the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

OSCE, 2008. *Ethnic minorities in Serbia: An Overview*. Belgrade: OSCE Mission to Serbia.

Osler, A. and Starkey H., 2001. Citizenship Education and National Identities in France and England: inclusive or exclusive? *Oxford Review of Education*, 27(2), 287-305.

Pantić, N., Closs, A. and V. Ivošević, 2011. *Teachers for the Future: Teacher Development for Inclusive Education in the Western Balkans*. Turin: European Training Foundation. Accessed on 15 March 2012 at:

[http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/9E076CFB736A59AFC125788F0033258C/\\$file/Teachers%20for%20the%20future\\_web.pdf](http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/9E076CFB736A59AFC125788F0033258C/$file/Teachers%20for%20the%20future_web.pdf)

Pavlović, B., 2006. Činioci i izazovi uspešnog obrazovanja za građansko društvo [Factors and challenges of successful education for civil society]. *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, 38(1), 205-224.

Rawls, J., 1993. *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rexhaj, X., Mula, M. and A. Hima, 2010. *Mapping Policies and Practices for the Preparation of Teachers for Inclusive Education in Contexts of Social and Cultural Diversity*. Kosovo (under UNSCR 1244) Country Report. Turin: European Training Foundation. Accessed on 15 March 2012 at:

[http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/C12578310056925BC125772E002C487E/\\$file/NOTE85SBG9.pdf](http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/C12578310056925BC125772E002C487E/$file/NOTE85SBG9.pdf)



Ritchie, J. and Spencer, L., 1994. *Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research*. In A. Bryman and R. Burgess, eds. *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. London: Routledge.

Sarajlić, E., 2012. *Conceptualising Citizenship Regime(s) in post-Dayton Bosnia and Herzegovina*. CITSEE Working Paper, School of Law, University of Edinburgh.

Scheppele, K. L., 2004. Constitutional Ethnography: An Introduction, *Law and Society Review*, 38, 398-406.

Shaw, J. and Štiks, I., 2012. *Introduction: Citizenship in the New States of South Eastern Europe*. CITSEE Working Paper, School of Law, University of Edinburgh.

Smith, A., Susan, F. and H. McLean, 2002. Građansko vaspitanje u osnovnim i srednjim školama u Republici Srbiji: Evaluacija prve godine 2001-2002 i preporuke [Civic education in primary and secondary schools in the republic of Serbia: Evaluation of the first year 2001-2002 and recommendations]. Belgrade: UNICEF; Paris: UNESCO; Belgrade: Fond za otvoreno društvo – Srbija; Budapest: Institut za otvoreno društvo.

Spaskovska, Lj., 2012. *The Fractured 'We' and the Ethno-National 'I' – the Macedonian Citizenship Framework*. CITSEE Working Paper, School of Law, University of Edinburgh.

Spiecker, B. and Steutel, J. 1995. Political liberalism, civic education and the Dutch government. *Journal of Moral Education*, 24 (4), 383-394.

Steiner-Khamsi, G., Torney-Purta, J. and J. Schwille, eds. 2002. *New paradigms and recurring paradoxes in education for citizenship: An international comparison*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Press.

Swimelar, S. 2012. Education in Post-war Bosnia: The Nexus of Societal Security, Identity and Nationalism. *Ethnopolitics*, iFirst, 1–22.

Tomasi, J., 1995. Kymlicka, Liberalism, and Respect for Cultural Minorities. *Ethics*, 105, 580-603.

UNICEF, 2009. *Study on multiculturalism and inter-ethnic relations in education*. Skopje: Unicef Country Office.

Ustav Crne Gore, 2007. *Službeni list Crne Gore*, br. 1/07. [Constitution of Montenegro. *Official Gazette of Montenegro*, no. 1/07].

Ustavni zakon o pravima nacionalnih manjina, 2002. *Službeni list Republike Hrvatske*, br. 155/02. [The Constitutional Act on the Rights of National Minorities. *Official Gazette of the Republic of Croatia*, no. 155/02].

Vasiljević, J., 2012. *Imagining and managing the nation: tracing citizenship policies in Serbia*. CITSEE Working Paper, School of Law, University of Edinburgh.

Vlada Crne Gore, 2007. Strategija građanskog vaspitanja i građanskog obrazovanja u osnovnim i srednjim školama u Crnoj Gori 2007-2010. [Strategy of civic education in primary and secondary schools in Montenegro]. Podgorica: Vlada Crne Gore, Zavod za školstvo.

VRCG, 2005. *Strateški plan reforme obrazovanja za period 2005.-2009. Godine*. [Strategic plan of education reform for period 2005.-2009.] Podgorica: Vlada Republike Crne Gore.

Zakon o manjinama Tuzlanskog Kantona, 2009. *Službeni glasnik TK*, br. 14/09. [Tuzla Canton Law on minorities. *Official Gazette of Tuzla Canton*, no 14/09.

Zakon o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja (ZOSOV), 2009. *Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije*, br. 72/09. [Law on the fundamentals of the education system. *Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia*, no. 72/2009].



ISSN 2046-4096